

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFREY SCOTT BOSMA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 21-cv-11398  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF  
INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL  
SERVICES,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER (1) ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF REPORT  
AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF No. 31); (2) GRANTING DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (ECF No. 23.); (3) DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL (ECF No.  
28); AND (4) DISMISSING PLAINTIFF’S CLAIMS**

On June 8, 2021, Plaintiff Jeffrey Scott Bosma, filed a *pro se* complaint in this Court against Defendant Michigan Department of Insurance and Financial Services (“DIFS”). (*See* ECF No. 1.) In his complaint, Bosma appears to allege violations of federal and state law concerning his efforts to become licensed to provide insurance services. (*See id.*)

On August 9, 2021, DIFS filed a motion for summary judgment on Bosma’s claims against it. (Mot., ECF No. 23.) Bosma filed a response on August 23, 2021 (Resp., ECF No. 27), and DIFS filed a reply on September 16, 2021 (ECF No. 26). On October 1, 2021, DIFS filed a supplemental brief explaining that DIFS had

issued Bosma the insurance licenses for which Bosma had applied, and arguing, *inter alia*, that his underlying lawsuit had consequently become moot. (DIFS Supp'l Br., ECF No. 29.) The assigned Magistrate Judge held a hearing on DIFS's motion on October 26, 2021.

On November 3, 2021, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation in which he recommended that the Court grant DIFS's motion for summary judgment (the "R&R"). (*See* ECF No. 31.) Specifically, the Magistrate Judge noted that Bosma "represented at the hearing that he is no longer pursuing relief" as to his federal claims, and that DIFS's motion as to those claims should be granted as unopposed. (*See id.*, PageID.2126.) As to Bosma's remaining claims, the Magistrate Judge recommended that DIFS's motion for summary judgment should be granted because, for a variety of reasons, the Magistrate Judge concluded the Court no longer had jurisdiction over those claims. At the conclusion of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge informed the parties that if they wanted to seek review of the recommendation, they needed to file specific objections with the Court within fourteen days. (*See id.*, PageID.379.)

Bosma has not filed any objections to the R&R. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Likewise, the failure to file objections to an R&R waives any further right to appeal. *See Howard v. Sec'y of Health and*

*Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, because Bosma has failed to file any objections to the R&R, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of the pending motion is **ADOPTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that (1) DIFS's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 23) is **GRANTED** and (2) Bosma's claims against DIFS are **DISMISSED**.

Also before the Court is Bosma's pending motion for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 28.) Because the Court is not persuaded that such appointment is necessary or appropriate here, **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT** Bosma's motion is **DENIED**.

s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: December 9, 2021

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on December 9, 2021, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda  
Case Manager  
(810) 341-9764